arXiv:1603.00444v1 [stat.ME] 1 Mar 2016

On divergences tests for composite hypotheses under composite likelihood

N. Martín[1], L. Pardo[2] K. Zografos[3]

[1]Department of Statistics and O.R. II, Complutense University of Madrid, 28003 Madrid, Spain
[2]Department of Statistics and O.R. I, Complutense University of Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain
[3]Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, 45110 Ioannina, Greece

Abstract

It is well-known that in some situations it is not easy to compute the likelihood function as the datasets might be large or the model is too complex. In that contexts composite likelihood, derived by multiplying the likelihoods of subjects of the variables, may be useful. The extension of the classical likelihood ratio test statistics to the framework of composite likelihoods is used as a procedure to solve the problem of testing in the context of composite likelihood. In this paper we introduce and study a new family of test statistics for composite likelihood: Composite ϕ-divergence test statistics for solving the problem of testing a simple null hypothesis or a composite null hypothesis. To do that we introduce and study the asymptotic distribution of the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimate.

AMS 2001 Subject Classification:

Keywords and phrases: Composite likelihoods, maximum composite likelihood estimator, restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator, composite likelihood ϕ-divergence test-statistics.

1 Introduction

Hypothesis testing is a cornerstone of mathematical statistics and, subsequently, the theory of log-likelihood ratio tests is a cornerstone in the theory of testing statistical hypotheses, too. On the other hand, maximum likelihood estimators play a key role in the development of log-likelihood ratio tests. Albeit maximum likelihood estimators can be easily obtained and they obey nice large sample properties, there are cases, like the case of complicated probabilistic models where the maximum likelihood estimators do not exist or they can not be obtained. In such a case the problem is usually overcomed by the use of pseudo-likelihood functions and the respective estimators which result by maximization of such a function. Composite likelihood and the respective composite likelihood estimators are an appealing case of pseudo-likelihood estimators. There is an extensive literature composite likelihood methods in Statistics. The history of the composite likelihood may be traced back to the pseudo-likelihood approach of Besag (1974) for modeling spatial data. The name of composite likelihood was given by Lindsay (1988) to refer a likelihood type object formed by multiplying together individual component likelihoods, each of which corresponds to a marginal or conditional event. Composite likelihood finds applications in a variety of fields, including genetics, spatial statistics, longitudinal analysis, multivariate modeling, to mention a few. The special issue, with guest editors Reid, Lindsay and Liang (2011), of the journal *Statistica Sinica* is devoted to

composite likelihood methods and applications in several fields and it, moreover, provides with an exhaustive and updated source of knowledge in the subject. The recent papers by Reid (2013) and Cattelan and Sartori (2016) concentrate on new developments on the composite likelihood inference.

Distance or divergence based on methods of estimation and testing are fundamental tools and constitute a methodological part in the field of statistical inference. The monograph by Kullback (1959) was probably the starting point of usage of the so called divergence measure for testing statistical hypotheses. The next important steps were the monographs by Read and Cressie (1988), Vajda (1989), Pardo (2006) and Basu et al. (2011) where distance, divergence or disparity methods were developed for estimation and testing. Thousands of papers have been also published in this frame and many of them have been exploited and mentioned in the above monographs. For testing a statistical hypothesis in a parametric framework, a test-statistic can be constructed by means of a distance or divergence measure between the empirical model and the model which is specified by the null hypothesis. The empirical model is the parametric model which governs the data with the unknown parameters to be replaced by their maximum likelihood estimators. The asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimators is exploited along with the well known delta method in order to reach the asymptotic distribution of the respective divergence test-statistics.

The divergence test-statistics are based on considering the distance between density functions, chosen in an appropriate way. In the statistical situations in which we only have composite densities it seems completely natural to define statistical procedures of testing based on divergence measures but between the composite densities instead of the densities. This paper is motivated by the necessity to develop divergence based on methods, described above, for testing statistical hypotheses when the maximum composite likelihood estimators are used instead of the classic maximum likelihood estimators and we consider divergence measures between composite density functions in order to get an appropriate test-statistic. In this framework, the next section introduces the notation which will be used and reviews composite likelihood estimators. Section 3 is devoted to present a family of ϕ-divergence test-statistics for testing simple null hypothesis. The formulation of testing composite null hypotheses by means of ϕ-divergence type test-statistics is the subject of Section 5. But in order to get the results in relation to the composite null hypothesis it is necessary in Section 4 to introduce and study the restricted maximum composite estimator as well its asymptotic distribution and the relationship between the restricted and the un-restricted maximum composite likelihood estimators. Section 6 is devoted to present a numerical example and finally a simulation study is carried out in Section 7. The proofs of the main theoretic results are provided in the Appendix.

2 Composite likelihood and divergence tests

We adopt here the notation by Joe et al. (2012) regarding composite likelihood function and the respective maximum composite likelihood estimators. In this regard, let $\{f(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\theta}), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p, p \geq 1\}$ be a parametric identifiable family of distributions for an observation $\boldsymbol{y}$, a realization of a random m-vector $\boldsymbol{Y}$. In this setting, the composite density based on K different margins or conditional distributions has the form

$$\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} f_{A_k}^{w_k}(y_j, j \in A_k; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

and the composite log-density based on K different margins or conditional distributions has the form

$$c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k \ell_{A_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}),$$

with

$$\ell_{A_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}) = \log f_{A_k}(y_j, j \in A_k; \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ is a family of random variables associated either with marginal or conditional distributions involving some y_j, $j \in \{1,...,m\}$ and w_k, $k = 1,...,K$ are non-negative and known weights. If the weights are all equal, then they can be ignored, actually all the statistical procedures produce equivalent results.

Let also $\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n$ be independent and identically distributed replications of $\boldsymbol{y}$. We denote by

$$c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)$$

the composite log-likelihood function for the whole sample. In complete accordance with the classic maximum likelihood estimator, the maximum composite likelihood estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ is defined by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k \ell_{A_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i).$$

It can be also obtained by the solution of the equation

$$\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n) = \mathbf{0}_p,$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n) = \frac{\partial c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k \frac{\partial \ell_{A_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}},$$

is the composite likelihood score function, that is the partial derivative of the composite log-likelihood with respect to the parameter vector.

The maximum composite likelihood estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ obeys asymptotic normality and in particular

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

where $\boldsymbol{G}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ denotes Godambe information matrix, defined by

$$\boldsymbol{G}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

with $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ being the sensitivity or Hessian matrix and $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ being the variability matrix, defined, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[-\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\boldsymbol{u}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})],\\ \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= Var_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})] = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})\boldsymbol{u}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})],\end{aligned}$$

where the superscript T denotes the transpose of a vector or a matrix.

The matrices $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are, by definition, nonegative definite matrices but throughout this paper both, $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, are assumed to be positive definite matrices. Since the component

score functions can be correlated, we have $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. If $c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})$ is a true log-likelihood function then $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, being $\boldsymbol{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ the Fisher information matrix of the model. Using multivariate version of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that the matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is non-negative definite, i.e., the full likelihood function is more efficient than any other composite likelihood function (cf. Lindsay, 1988, Lemma 4A).

For two densities p and q associated with two m-dimensional random variables respectively, Csiszár's ϕ-divergence between p and q is defined by

$$D_\phi(p,q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} q(\boldsymbol{y})\phi\left(\frac{p(\boldsymbol{y})}{q(\boldsymbol{y})}\right) d\boldsymbol{y},$$

where ϕ is a real valued convex function, satisfying appropriate conditions which ensure the existence of the above integral (cf., Csiszár, 1963, 1967, Ali and Silvey 1963, and Pardo, 2006. Csiszár's ϕ-divergence has been axiomatically characterized and studied extensively by Liese and Vajda (1987, 2006), Vajda (1989), and Stummer and Vajda (2010), among many others. Particular choices of the convex functions ϕ, lead to important measures of divergence including Kullback and Leibler (1951) divergence, Rényi (1960) divergence and Cressie and Read (1984) λ-power divergence, to mention a few. Csiszár's ϕ-divergence can be extended and used in testing hypotheses on more than two distributions (cf. Zografos (1998) and references appeared therein).

In this paper we are going to consider ϕ-divergence measures between the composite densities $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{y})$ in order to solve different problems of testing hypotheses. The ϕ-divergence measure between composite densities $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{y})$ will be defined by

$$D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m} \mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{y})\phi\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{y})}\right) d\boldsymbol{y}, \tag{1}$$

$\phi \in \Psi$, with

$$\Psi = \{\phi : \phi \text{ is strictly convex, } \phi(1) = \phi'(1) = 0, 0\phi\left(\tfrac{0}{0}\right) = 0, 0\phi\left(\tfrac{u}{0}\right) = u\lim_{v\to\infty}\tfrac{\phi(v)}{v}\}.$$

An important particular case is the Kullback-Leibler divergence measure obtained from (1) with $\phi(x) = x\log x - x + 1$, i.e.

$$D_{Kullback}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m} \mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{y})\log\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{y})} d\boldsymbol{y}.$$

Based on (1) we shall present in this paper some new test-statistics for testing simple null hypothesis as well as composite null hypothesis. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that ϕ-divergences are used for solving testing problems in the context of composite likelihood. However, the Kullback-Leibler divergence has been used, in the context of composite likelihood, by many authors in model selection, see for instance Varin (2008).

3 Hypothesis testing: Simple null hypothesis

In this section we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0. \tag{2}$$

If we consider the ϕ-divergence between the composite densities $\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})$,

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)=\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})\phi\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})}\right)d\boldsymbol{y}$$

verifies $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\geq 0$, and the equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})=\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})$**.** Small values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ are in favour of $H_0:\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, while large values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, suggest rejection of H_0. This is due to the fact that large values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ suggest that the model $\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})$ is not very close to $\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})$. Therefore, H_0 is rejected if $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)>c$, where c is specified so that the significance level of the test is α. In order to obtain c, in the next theorem we shall obtain the asymptotic distribution of

$$T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)=\frac{2n}{\phi''(1)}D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0),\tag{3}$$

which we shall refer to as composite ϕ-divergence test-statistics for testing simple null hypothesis.

Theorem 1 *Under the null hypothesis* $H_0:\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$,

$$T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i Z_i^2,$$

where λ_i, $i=1,...,k$, *are the eigenvalues of the matrix* $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$,

$$k=\operatorname{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right),$$

and $Z_1,...Z_r$ *are independent standard normal random variables.*

Proof. Under the standard regularity assumptions of asymptoitc statistics (cf. Serfling, 1980, p. 144 and Pardo, 2006, p. 58), we have

$$\frac{\partial D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial\theta}=\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\phi'\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})}\right)d\boldsymbol{y},$$

therefore

$$\left.\frac{\partial D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial\theta}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}=\phi'(1)\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}d\boldsymbol{y}=\mathbf{0}_p.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial^2 D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\\&=\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\phi'\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})}\right)d\boldsymbol{y}+\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\frac{\partial\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\frac{1}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})}\phi''\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})}\right)d\boldsymbol{y}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}=\phi''(1)\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left.\frac{\partial c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\frac{\partial c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\boldsymbol{y})d\boldsymbol{y}=\phi''(1)\,\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0).$$

Then, from

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \frac{\phi''(1)}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$$

the desired result is obtained. The value of k comes from

$$k = \operatorname{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right) = \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)).$$

■

Remark 1 *Based on the previous Theorem we shall reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ if $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) > c_\alpha$, where c_α is the quantile of order $1-\alpha$ of the asymptotic distribution of $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ given in (3). The value of k is usually p, since the components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are assumed to be non-redundant.*

In most cases, the power function of this testing procedure can not be calculated explicitly. In the following theorem we present a useful asymptotic result for approximating the power function.

Theorem 2 *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ be the true parameter, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Then it holds*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_\phi^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\right),$$

where

$$\sigma_\phi^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \boldsymbol{q}^T \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{q}$$

and $\boldsymbol{q} = (q_1, ..., q_p)^T$ with $q_j = \left.\frac{\partial D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \theta_j}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$, $j = 1, ..., p$.

Proof. A first order Taylor expansion gives

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \boldsymbol{q}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) + o(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\right\|).$$

But

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)$$

and $\sqrt{n}o(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\right\|) = o_p(1)$. Now the result follows. ■

Remark 2 *From Theorem 2, a first approximation to the power function, at $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, is given by*

$$\beta_{n,\phi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}\left(\frac{\phi''(1)c_\alpha}{2n} - D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right)\right)$$

where Φ is the standard normal distribution function. If some $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is the true parameter, the probability of rejecting $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ with the rejection rule $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) > c_\alpha$, for fixed significance level α, tends to one as $n \to \infty$. Hence, the test is consistent in Fraser's sense.

4 Restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator

In some common situations such as the problem of testing composite null hypotheses, it is necessary to get the maximum composite likelihood estimator which is restricted by some restrictions of the type

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r, \tag{4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{g}$ is a function such that $\boldsymbol{g} : \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$, r is an integer, with $r < p$ and $\mathbf{0}_r$ denotes the null vector of dimension r. The function $\boldsymbol{g}$ is a vector valued function such that the $p \times r$ matrix

$$\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{g}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \tag{5}$$

exists and is continuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with $\text{rank}(\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = r$. The restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is defined by

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta, \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\mathbf{0}_r}{\arg\max} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta, \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\mathbf{0}_r}{\arg\max} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k \ell_{A_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i).$$

and is obtained by the solution of the restricted likelihood equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) + \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}_p,$$

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is a vector of Lagrange multipliers.

In this section we shall get the asymptotic distribution of the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator. Consider a random sample $\boldsymbol{y}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{y}_n$ from the parametric model $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p, p \geq 1$, and let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$ be the unrestricted and the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimators of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The following result derives the asymptotic distribution of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$.

Theorem 3 *Under the constraints $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r$ the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator obeys asymptotic normality in the sense*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_p, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{rc}),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{rc} &= \boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{P}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\
\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\
\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= -\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \left[\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the Theorem is outlined in Section 9.1 of Appendix.

The lemma that follows formulates the relationship between the maximum composite and the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$ respectively.

Lemma 4 *The estimators of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$, satisfy*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left(\boldsymbol{I}_p + \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_P(1).$$

The proof of the lemma is given in Section 9.2 of Appendix.

5 Composite null hypothesis

Following Basu et al. (2015), consider the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \Theta_0,$$

which restricts the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to a subset Θ_0 of $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p, p \geq 1$. Based on Sen and Singer (1993, p. 239), we shall assume that the composite null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0$ can be equivalently formulated in the form

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r. \tag{6}$$

For testing the composite null hypothesis (6) on the basis of a random sample $\boldsymbol{y}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{y}_n$ from the parametric model $f(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \geq 1$, there are well-known procedures to be applied. The likelihood ratio test-statistic, the Wald and Rao statistics are used in this direction. Test-statistics based on divergences or disparities, as they have been described and mentioned above, constitute an appealing procedure for testing this hypothesis. Moreover, there are composite likelihood methods analog to the likelihood ratio test or the Wald test. However, there are not composite likelihood versions of the tests based on divergence measures, to the best of our knowledge. So, our aim in this Section is to develop test-statistics for testing (6), on the basis of divergence measures and in the composite likelihood framework. The ϕ-divergence between the composite densities $\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y})$, is given by

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m} \mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y})\phi\left(\frac{\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y})}\right) d\boldsymbol{y}.$$

Based on the property $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \geq 0$, with equality, if and only if $\mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y}) = \mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})$, small values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ are in favour of (6), while large values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ suggest that the composite densities $\mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y})$ are not the same and the same is expected for the respective theoretic models f_θ with $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ and f_θ with $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0$. So, small values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ are in favor of (6) while large values of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ suggest the rejection of H_0. Given the asymptotic normality of the maximum composite likelihood estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$, the asymptotic normality of the respective restricted estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$ should be verified. The asymptotic normality of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$ and the investigation of the asymptotic distribution of the test-statistic $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ is the subject of the next section.

Based on Theorem 3 and Lemma 4, the composite likelihood ϕ-divergence test-statistic is introduced in the next theorem and its asymptotic distribution is derived under the composite null hypothesis (6). The standard regularity assumptions of asymptotic statistic are assumed to be valid (cf. Serfling, 1980, p. 144 and Pardo, 2006, p. 58).

Theorem 5 *Under the composite null hypothesis (6),*

$$T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{2n}{\phi''(1)} D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i Z_i^2,$$

where β_i, $i = 1, ..., k$, are the eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

$$k = \operatorname{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

and $Z_1, ...Z_r$ are independent standard normal random variables.

The proof of this Theorem is presented in Appendix C. In the following we refer $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ by composite ϕ-divergence test-statistics for testing composite null hypothesis.

Remark 3 *For the testing problem considered in this Section it is perhaps well-known the composite likelihood ratio test but it was not possible for us to find it in the statistical literature. This test will be used in Section 4 and this is the reason to develop the said test in the present remark.*
We shall denote

$$c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i\right)$$

The composite likelihood ratio test for testing the composite null hypothesis (6), considered in this paper, is defined by

$$\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})=2\left(c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c)-c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right).$$

A second order Taylor expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned}&c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y}_i)-c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y}_i)\\&=\left.\frac{\partial c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i\right)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})+\frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T\left.\frac{\partial^2 c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i\right)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})+o_P(1).\end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\left.\frac{\partial c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i\right)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}=\mathbf{0}_p\quad and\quad\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left.\frac{\partial^2 c\ell\left(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i\right)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{a.s.}-\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0),$$

and therefore,

$$2(c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c)-c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}))=\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})+o_P(1)$$

which yields

$$\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})=2(c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c)-c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}))\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\gamma_i Z_i^2,\tag{7}$$

where γ_i, $i=1,...,\ell$ are the non null eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

with

$$\ell=\operatorname{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

and Z_i, $i=1,...,\ell$ are independent standard normal random variables.

Remark 4 *In order to avoid the problem of getting percentiles or probabilities from the distribution of linear combinations of chi-squares we are going to present some adjusted composite likelihood ϕ-divergence test-statistics.*

Following Corollary 1 of Rao and Scott (1981) one can use the statistic

$${}^1T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})=\frac{T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})}{\lambda_{\max}}\leq\sum_{i=1}^{r}Z_i^2,$$

where $\lambda_{\max} = \max(\beta_1, ..., \beta_r)$. *As* $\sum_{i=1}^{r} Z_i^2 \sim \chi_r^2$, *a strategy that rejects the null hypothesis* $H_0 : \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r$ *for* ${}^1T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{r,1-\alpha}$ *produces an asymptotically conservative test at* α *nominal level , where* $\chi^2_{r,1-\alpha}$ *is the quantile of order* $1-\alpha$ *for* χ_r^2.

Another approximation to the asymptotic tail probabilities of $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ *can be obtained through the modification*

$$ {}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})}{\overline{\lambda}}, $$

where $\bar{\lambda} = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i$ *(see Satterthwaite, 1946), considered approximated by a chi-squared distribution with* r *degrees of freedom. In this case we can observe that*

$$ E\left[{}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right] = r = E\left[\chi_r^2\right], $$

$$ Var\left[{}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right] = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta_i^2}{\overline{\lambda}^2} = 2r + 2\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{\left(\beta_i - \overline{\lambda}\right)^2}{\overline{\lambda}^2} > 2r = Var\left[\chi_r^2\right]. $$

If we denote by $\Lambda = \operatorname{diag}(\beta_1, ..., \beta_r)$, *we get*

$$ E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\beta_i Z_i^2\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\beta_i = \operatorname{trace}(\Lambda) = \operatorname{trace}\left(\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right). $$

The test given by the statistic ${}^2T_{\phi,n}(f_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}, f_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_R})$ *is more conservative than the one based on*

$$ {}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{{}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})}{\nu} = \frac{T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})}{\nu\overline{\lambda}}, $$

and we can find ν *by imposing the condition* $Var\left[{}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right] = 2E\left[{}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right]$, *as in the chi-squared distribution. Since*

$$ E\left[{}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right] = \frac{r}{\nu} \text{ and } Var\left[{}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right] = \frac{2r}{\nu}, $$

$$ \nu = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{\left(\beta_i - \overline{\lambda}\right)^2}{r\overline{\lambda}^2} = 1 + CV^2(\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^r), $$

where CV represents the coefficient of variation. Then a chi-square distribution with $\frac{r}{\nu}$ *degrees of freedom approximates the asymptotic distribution of the statistic* ${}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ *for large* n.

The degrees of freedom of ${}^3T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ *is* $\frac{k}{\nu}$, *which may not be an integer. To avoid this difficulty one can modify the statistic such that the first two moments match specifically with the* χ_r^2 *distribution (rather than with just any other* χ^2 *distribution). Specifically let*

$$ X = {}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}). $$

We have

$$ E[X] = r = E\left[\chi_r^2\right], $$

$$ Var[X] = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta_i{}^2}{\overline{\lambda}^2} = 2r + 2\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{\left(\beta_i - \overline{\lambda}\right)^2}{\overline{\lambda}^2} = 2r + c, $$

where c stands for the last indicated term in the previous expression. We define $Y = (X - a)/b$, *where the constants* a *and* b *are such that*

$$E(Y) = r, \quad Var(Y) = 2r.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{r-a}{b} = r, \quad \frac{2r+c}{b^2} = 2r.$$

Solving these equations, we get

$$b = \sqrt{1 + \frac{c}{2r}}, \quad a = r(1-b).$$

Thus it makes sense to consider another modification of the statistic given by

$${}^4T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{{}^2T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) - a}{b},$$

the large sample distribution of which may be approximated by the χ^2_r *distribution.*

The approximation presented in this remark for the asymptotic distribution of the ϕ-divergence test-statistics, $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$, can be used in the approximation of the ϕ-divergence test-statistics $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ as well.

By the previous theorem, the null hypothesis should be rejected if $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \geq c_\alpha$, where c_α is the quantile of order $1-\alpha$ of the asymptotic distribution of $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$. The following theorem can be used to approximate the power function. Assume that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \Theta_0$ is the true value of the parameter so that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and that there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta_0$ such that the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator satisfies $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$, as well as

$$n^{1/2}\left((\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) - (\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_p \\ \mathbf{0}_p \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{A}_{12}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \\ \boldsymbol{A}_{12}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \end{pmatrix}\right),$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}_{12}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ are appropriate $p \times p$ matrices . We have then the following result.

Theorem 6 *Under* H_1 *we have*

$$n^{1/2}\left(D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) - D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\right)$$

where

$$\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \boldsymbol{t}^T\boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\boldsymbol{t} + 2\boldsymbol{t}^T\boldsymbol{A}_{12}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\boldsymbol{s} + \boldsymbol{s}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\,\boldsymbol{s} \tag{8}$$

being

$$\boldsymbol{t} = \left.\frac{\partial D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1=\boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{s} = \left.\frac{\partial D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2,\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}_2}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}.$$

Proof. The result follows in a straightforward manner by considering a first order Taylor expansion of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$, which yields

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) + \boldsymbol{t}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{s}^T(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) + o(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\right\| + \left\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\right\|).$$

■

Remark 5 *On the basis of the previous theorem we can get an approximation of the power function*

$$\pi_n^{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = Pr_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\left(T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \geq c\right)$$

at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ *as*

$$\pi_{n,\alpha}^{\beta,\gamma}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}\left(\frac{c}{2n} - D_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\right)\right), \tag{9}$$

where $\Phi(x)$ *is the standard normal distribution function and* $\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ *was defined in (8).*

If some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ *is the true parameter, then the probability of rejecting* H_0 *with the rule that it is rejected when* $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \geq c$ *for a fixed test size* α *tends to one as* $n \to \infty$*. The test-statistic is consistent in the Fraser's sense.*

Obtaining the approximate sample size n *to guarantee a power of* π *at a given alternative* $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ *is an interesting application of formula (9). Let* n^* *be the positive root of the equation (9), i.e.*

$$n^* = \frac{A + B + \sqrt{A(A+2B)}}{2D_{\phi}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)},$$

where

$$A = \sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\left(\Phi^{-1}(1-\pi)\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B = cD_{\phi}(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}).$$

Then the required sample size is $n = [n^*] + 1$*, where* $[\cdot]$ *is used to denote "integer part of".*

Remark 6 *The class of* ϕ*-divergence measures is a wide family of divergence measures but unfortunately there are some classical divergence measures that are not included in this family of* ϕ*-divergence measures such as the Rényi's divergence or the Sharma and Mittal's divergence. The expression of Rényi's divergence is given by*

$$D_{Rényi}^{a}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{1}{a(a-1)} \log \int_{R^m} \mathcal{CL}^a(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \boldsymbol{y}) \mathcal{CL}^{1-a}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}, \boldsymbol{y}) d\boldsymbol{y} \ , \ \text{if } a \neq 0, 1,$$

with

$$D_{Rényi}^{0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \lim_{a \to 0} D_{Rényi}^{a}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = D_{\text{Kull}}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c) = \int_{R^m} \mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \boldsymbol{y}) \log \frac{\mathcal{CL}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \boldsymbol{y})}{\mathcal{CL}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}, \boldsymbol{y})} d\boldsymbol{y}$$

and

$$D_{Rényi}^{1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \lim_{a \to 1} D_{Rényi}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = D_{\text{Kull}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}).$$

This measure of divergence was introduced in Rényi (1961) for $a > 0$ *and* $a \neq 1$ *and Liese and Vajda (1987) extended it for all* $a \neq 1, 0$*. An interesting divergence measure related to Rényi divergence measure is the Bhattacharya divergence defined as the Rényi divergence for* $a = 1/2$ *divided by* 4*. Other interesting example of divergence measure, not included in the family of* ϕ*-divergence measures, is the divergence measures introduced by Sharma and Mittal (1997).*

In order to unify the previous divergence measures as well as another divergence measures Menéndez et al. (1995, 1997) introduced the family of divergences called "(h, ϕ)-divergence measures" in the following way

$$D_{\phi}^{h}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = h\left(D_{\phi}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right),$$

where h is a differentiable increasing function mapping from $\left[0, \phi(0) + \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{t}\right]$ onto $[0, \infty)$, with $h(0) = 0$, $h'(0) > 0$, and $\phi \in \Psi$. In the next table these divergence measures are presented, along with the corresponding expressions of h and ϕ.

Divergence	$h(x)$	$\phi(x)$
Rényi	$\frac{1}{a(a-1)} \log(a(a-1)x+1), \quad a \neq 0,1$	$\frac{x^a - a(x-1) - 1}{a(a-1)}, \quad a \neq 0,1$
Sharma-Mittal	$\frac{1}{b-1}\left\{[1+a(a-1)x]^{\frac{b-1}{a-1}} - 1\right\}, \quad b, a \neq 1$	$\frac{x^a - a(x-1) - 1}{a(a-1)}, \quad a \neq 0,1$

Based on the (h,ϕ)-divergence measures we can define a new family of (h,ϕ)-divergence test-statistics for testing the null hypothesis H_0 given in (6)

$$T_{h,\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{2n}{\phi''(1)h'(0)} h\left(D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right). \tag{10}$$

Since

$$h(x) = h(0) + h'(0)x + o(x)$$

the asymptotic distribution of $T_{h,\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$ coincides with the asymptotic distribution of $T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$. In a similar way we can define the family of (h,ϕ)-divergence test-statistics for testing the null hypothesis H_0 given in (2) by

$$T_{h,\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \frac{2n}{\phi''(1)h'(0)} h\left(D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\right).$$

6 Numerical Example

In this section we shall consider an example, studied previously by Xu and Reid (2011) on the robustness of maximum composite estimator. The aim of this section is to clarify the different issues which are discussed in the previous sections.

Consider the random vector $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4)^T$ which follows a four dimensional normal distribution with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4)^T$ and variance-covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & 2\rho & 2\rho \\ \rho & 1 & 2\rho & 2\rho \\ 2\rho & 2\rho & 1 & \rho \\ 2\rho & 2\rho & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

i.e., we suppose that the correlation between Y_1 and Y_2 is the same as the correlation between Y_3 and Y_4. Taking into account that Σ must be semi-definite positive, the following condition is imposed, $-\frac{1}{5} \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$. In order to avoid several problems regarding the consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator of the parameter ρ (cf. Xu and Reid, 2011), we shall consider the composite likelihood function

$$\mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f_{A_1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}) f_{A_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}),$$

where

$$f_{A_1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f_{12}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \rho, y_1, y_2),$$
$$f_{A_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f_{34}(\mu_3, \mu_4, \rho, y_3, y_4),$$

where f_{12} and f_{34} are the densities of the marginals of $\boldsymbol{Y}$, i.e. bivariate normal distributions with mean vectors $(\mu_1, \mu_2)^T$ and $(\mu_3, \mu_4)^T$, respectively, and common variance-covariance matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

with expressions given by

$$f_{h,h+1}(\mu_h, \mu_{h+1}, \rho, y_h, y_{h+1}) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left\{-\tfrac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)} Q(y_h, y_{h+1})\right\},\ h \in \{1, 3\},$$

being

$$Q(y_h, y_{h+1}) = (y_h - \mu_h)^2 - 2\rho(y_h - \mu_h)(y_{h+1} - \mu_{h+1}) + (y_{h+1} - \mu_{h+1})^2,\ h \in \{1, 3\}.$$

In this context, the interest is focused in testing the composite null hypothesis hypotheses

$$H_0 : \rho = \rho_0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : \rho \neq \rho_0, \tag{12}$$

by using the composite ϕ-divergence test-statistics, presented above. In this case, the parameter space is given by

$$\Theta = \left\{\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \rho)^T : \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, ..., 4 \text{ and } -\tfrac{1}{5} \leq \rho \leq \tfrac{1}{3}\right\}.$$

If we consider $g : \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^5 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with

$$g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = g((\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \rho)^T) = \rho - \rho_0, \tag{13}$$

the parameter space under the null hypothesis is given by

$$\Theta_0 = \left\{\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \rho)^T \in \Theta : g(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \rho) = 0\right\}.$$

It is now clear that the dimensions of both parameter spaces are $\dim(\Theta) = 5$ and $\dim(\Theta_0) = 4$. Consider now a random sample of size n, $\boldsymbol{y}_i = (y_{i1}, ..., y_{i4})^T$, $i = 1, ..., n$. The maximum composite likelihood estimators of the parameters μ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and ρ in Θ are obtained by standard maximization of the composite log-density function associated to the random sample of size n,

$$\begin{aligned} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{y}_n) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \mathcal{CL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\log f_{A_1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) + \log f_{A_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i)\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell_{A_1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell_{A_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{y}_i) \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \log\left(1 - \rho^2\right) - \frac{1}{2\left(1 - \rho^2\right)} (\varsigma_1^2 + \varsigma_2^2 + \varsigma_3^2 + \varsigma_4^2 - 2\rho(\varsigma_{12} + \varsigma_{34})) + k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_j^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{ij} - \mu_j)^2,\ j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \\ \varsigma_{h,h+1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{ih} - \mu_h)(y_{i,h+1} - \mu_{h+1}),\ h \in \{1, 3\}, \end{aligned}$$

and k is a constant no dependent of the unknown parameters, i.e., by solving the system of the following system of five equations

$$\begin{aligned}(\overline{y}_1-\mu_1)-\rho(\overline{y}_2-\mu_2)&=0,\\ (\overline{y}_2-\mu_2)-\rho(\overline{y}_1-\mu_1)&=0,\\ (\overline{y}_3-\mu_3)-\rho(\overline{y}_4-\mu_4)&=0,\\ (\overline{y}_4-\mu_4)-\rho(\overline{y}_3-\mu_3)&=0,\\ n\rho^3-\frac{\varsigma_{12}+\varsigma_{34}}{2}\rho^2+\left(\frac{\varsigma_1^2+\varsigma_2^2+\varsigma_3^2+\varsigma_4^2}{2}-n\right)\rho-\frac{\varsigma_{12}+\varsigma_{34}}{2}&=0,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\overline{y}_j=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}y_{ij},\ j\in\{1,2,3,4\}. \tag{14}$$

From the first two equations we get

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\overline{y}_1-\mu_1)-\rho^2(\overline{y}_2-\mu_2)&=0,\\ -\rho(\overline{y}_1-\mu_1)+\overline{y}_2-\mu_2&=0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\left(1-\rho^2\right)(\overline{y}_2-\mu_2)=0,$$

and since we assume that $\rho\in(-\frac{1}{5},\frac{1}{3})\subset(-1,1)$, it is obtained that

$$\widehat{\mu}_1=\overline{y}_1\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{\mu}_2=\overline{y}_2.$$

In a similar manner, from the third and fourth equations we can get that

$$\widehat{\mu}_3=\overline{y}_3\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{\mu}_4=\overline{y}_4.$$

The maximum composite likelihood estimator of ρ under Θ, $\widehat{\rho}$, is the real solution of the following cubic equation

$$\rho^3-\frac{v_{12}+v_{34}}{2}\rho^2+\left(\frac{v_1^2+v_2^2+v_3^2+v_4^2}{2}-1\right)\rho-\frac{v_{12}+v_{34}}{2}=0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}v_j^2=\frac{1}{n}\widehat{\varsigma}_j^2&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_{ij}-\overline{y}_j)^2,\ j\in\{1,2,3,4\},\\ v_{h,h+1}=\frac{1}{n}\widehat{\varsigma}_{h,h+1}&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_{ih}-\overline{y}_h)(y_{i,h+1}-\overline{y}_{h+1}),\ h\in\{1,3\},\end{aligned}$$

and v_j^2, $j\in\{1,2,3,4\}$, are sampling variances and $v_{h,h+1}$, $h\in\{1,3\}$, sampling covariances.

Under Θ_0, the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimators of the parameters μ_j, $j\in\{1,2,3,4\}$ are given by,

$$\widetilde{\mu}_j=\overline{y}_j,\ j\in\{1,2,3,4\},$$

with $\overline{y}_i$ given by (14). Therefore, in our model, the maximum composite likelihood estimators are

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c=(\overline{y}_1,\overline{y}_2,\overline{y}_3,\overline{y}_4,\widehat{\rho})^T\ \text{and}\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}=(\overline{y}_1,\overline{y}_2,\overline{y}_3,\overline{y}_4,\rho_0)^T,$$

under Θ and Θ_0 respectively.

After some heavy algebraic manipulations the sensitivity or Hessian matrix $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\rho & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\rho & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\rho & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\rho & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2\frac{1+\rho^2}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

In a similar manner, the expression of the variability matrix $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ coincides with that of sensitivity matrix $\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

In order to get the unique non zero eigenvalue β_1 from Theorem 5, it is necessary to obtain (5), which, in the present setup, is given by

$$\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = (0,0,0,0,1)^T, \tag{16}$$

where $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is given by (13) in the context of the present example. In addition, taking into account that $\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and after some algebra, it is concluded that $\beta_1 = 1$ and therefore the asymptotic distribution of the composite ϕ-divergence test-statistics is

$$T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{2n}{\phi''(1)} D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_1,$$

under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \rho = \rho_0$. In a completely similar manner, the composite likelihood ratio test, presented in Remark 1, for testing $H_0 : \rho = \rho_0$, is

$$\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = 2\left(c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c) - c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_1,$$

because the only non zero eigenvalue of the asymptotic distribution (7) is equal to one.

In a similar way, if we consider the composite (h,ϕ)-divergence test-statistics, we have

$$T_{h,\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \frac{2n}{\phi''(1)h'(0)} h\left(D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_1.$$

I order to apply the above theoretic issues in practice it is necessary to consider a particular convex function ϕ in order to get a concrete ϕ-divergence or to consider ϕ and h in order to get an (h,ϕ)-divergence. Using the Rényi's family of divergences, i.e, a family of (h,ϕ)-divergences with ϕ and h given in Table 1, the family of test-statistics is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T^r_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) &= \frac{2n}{r(r-1)}\left(\log \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{f^r_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2)}{f^{r-1}_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \rho_0, y_1, y_2)} dy_1 dy_2 + \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{f^r_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \widehat{\rho}, y_3, y_4)}{f^{r-1}_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \rho_0, y_3, y_4)} dy_3 dy_4\right) \\ &= \frac{4n}{r(r-1)} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{f^r_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2)}{f^{r-1}_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \rho_0, y_1, y_2)} dy_1 dy_2, \end{aligned}$$

for $r \neq 0, 1$. The last equality follows becuase the integrals does not depend on $\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2$, $\widehat{\mu}_3$ and $\widehat{\mu}_4$. For $r = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^1_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) &= 2n\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \widehat{\rho}, y_3, y_4) dy_3 dy_4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2) \log \frac{f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2)}{f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \rho_0, y_1, y_2)} dy_1 dy_2\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2) dy_1 dy_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \widehat{\rho}, y_3, y_4) \log \frac{f_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \widehat{\rho}, y_3, y_4)}{f_{34}(\widehat{\mu}_3, \widehat{\mu}_4, \rho_0, y_3, y_4)} dy_3 dy_4\right) \\ &= 4n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2) \log \frac{f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \widehat{\rho}, y_1, y_2)}{f_{12}(\widehat{\mu}_1, \widehat{\mu}_2, \rho_0, y_1, y_2)} dy_1 dy_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$T_n^0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = T_n^1(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c).$$

Based on the expression for Rényi divergence in normal populations (for more details see Pardo, 2006, p. 33) we have

$$T_n^r(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \begin{cases} \frac{2n}{r(r-1)}\log\frac{(1-\rho_0^2)^r(1-\widehat{\rho}^2)^{-(r-1)}}{1-[r\rho_0+(1-r)\widehat{\rho}]^2}, & r\notin\{0,1\},\ \widehat{\rho}\in\left(\frac{r}{r-1}\rho_0-\frac{1}{|r-1|},\frac{r}{r-1}\rho_0+\frac{1}{|r-1|}\right), \\ +\infty, & r\notin\{0,1\},\ \widehat{\rho}\notin\left(\frac{r}{r-1}\rho_0-\frac{1}{|r-1|},\frac{r}{r-1}\rho_0+\frac{1}{|r-1|}\right), \\ 2n\left(\log\frac{1-\rho_0^2}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}+2\frac{\rho_0(\rho_0-\widehat{\rho})}{1-\rho_0^2}\right), & r=1, \\ 2n\left(\log\frac{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}{1-\rho_0^2}+2\frac{\widehat{\rho}(\widehat{\rho}-\rho_0)}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}\right), & r=0. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Similarly, using the Cressie-Read's family of divergences, the family of test-statistics is given by

$$T_n^\lambda(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \begin{cases} \frac{4n}{\lambda(\lambda+1)}\left(\sqrt{\frac{(1-\rho_0^2)^{\lambda+1}(1-\widehat{\rho}^2)^{-\lambda}}{1-[(\lambda+1)\rho_0-\lambda\widehat{\rho}]^2}}-1\right), & \lambda\notin\{0,-1\},\ \widehat{\rho}\in\left(\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda}\rho_0-\frac{1}{|\lambda|},\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda}\rho_0+\frac{1}{|\lambda|}\right), \\ +\infty, & \lambda\notin\{0,-1\},\ \widehat{\rho}\notin\left(\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda}\rho_0-\frac{1}{|\lambda|},\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda}\rho_0+\frac{1}{|\lambda|}\right), \\ 2n\left(\log\frac{1-\rho_0^2}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}+2\frac{\rho_0(\rho_0-\widehat{\rho})}{1-\rho_0^2}\right)=T_n^1(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}), & \lambda=0, \\ 2n\left(\log\frac{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}{1-\rho_0^2}+2\frac{\widehat{\rho}(\widehat{\rho}-\rho_0)}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}\right)=T_n^0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}), & \lambda=-1. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

After some algebra we can also obtain the composite likelihood ratio test. This has the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) &= 2\left(c\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n)-c\ell(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc},\boldsymbol{y}_1,...,\boldsymbol{y}_n)\right) \\ &= 2n\left[\log\frac{1-\rho_0^2}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}+(v_1^2+v_2^2+v_3^2+v_4^2)\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho_0^2}-\frac{1}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}\right)-2(v_{12}+v_{34})\left(\frac{\rho_0}{1-\rho_0^2}-\frac{\widehat{\rho}}{1-\widehat{\rho}^2}\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

7 Simulation study

In this section a simulation study is presented in order to study the behavior of the composite ϕ-divergence test-statistics. The theoretical model studied in the previous section is followed by using the composite Cressie-Read test-statistics (18). The composite likelihood ratio test-statistic (CLRT), given in (19), is also considered. A special attention has been paid to the hypothesis testing (12) with $\rho_0\in\{-0.1,0.2\}$. The case $\rho_0=0$ has been considered, but this case is less important since taking into account the way of the theoretical model under consideration and having the case of independent observations, the composite likelihood theory is useless. For finite sample sizes and nominal size $\alpha=0.05$, the estimated significance level for different composite Cressie-Read test-statistics as well as for the CLRT, are given by

$$\alpha_n^{(\lambda)}(\rho_0)=\Pr(T_n^\lambda(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})>\chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_0),\ \lambda\in\mathbb{R} \text{ and } \alpha_n^{(CLRT)}(\rho_0)=\Pr\left(\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})>\chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_0\right).$$

More thorougly, the composite Cressie-Read test-statistics with $\lambda\in\{-1,-0.5,0.2/3,1,1.5\}$ have beed selected for the study. Following Dale (1986), we consider the inequality

$$\left|\text{logit}(1-\alpha_n^{(\bullet)})-\text{logit}(1-\alpha)\right|\leq\varepsilon \tag{20}$$

where $\text{logit}(p) = \ln(p/(1-p))$. By chosing $\varepsilon = 0.45$ the composite test-statistics valid for the study are limited to those verifying $\alpha_n^{(\lambda)} \in (0.0325, 0.07625)$. This criterion has been used in many previous studies, see for instance Cressie et al (2003), Martín et al. (2014), Martín and Pardo (2012) and references therein.

Through $R = 10,000$ replications of the simulation experiment, with the model under the null hypothesis, the estimated significance level for different composite Cressie-Read test-statistics are

$$\widehat{\alpha}_n^{(\lambda)}(\rho_0) = \widehat{\Pr}(T_n^{\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_0) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R} I(T_{n,i}^{\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|\rho_0)}{R},$$

with $I(S)$ being and indicator function (with value 1 if S is true and 0 otherwise) and the estimated significance level for CLRT

$$\widehat{\alpha}_n^{(CLRT)}(\rho_0) = \widehat{\Pr}(\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_0) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R} I(\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|\rho_0)}{R}.$$

In Table 1 we present the simulated level for different values of $\lambda \in \{-1, -0.5, 0.2/3, 1, 1.5\}$ as well as for the CLRT, when $n = 100$, $n = 200$ and $n = 300$ for $\rho_0 = -0.1$ and $\rho_0 = 0.2$. In order to investigate the behavior for $\rho_0 = 0$ we present in Table 2 the simulated level for $\lambda \in \{-1, -0.5, 0.2/3, 1, 1.5\}$ as well as the simulated level of CLRT for $n = 50$, $n = 100$, $n = 200$ and $n = 300$. Clearly, as expected the performance of the traditional divergence and likelihood methods is stronger in comparison with the composite divergence and likelihood methods.

	$n = 100$		$n = 200$		$n = 300$	
	$\rho_0 = -0.1$	$\rho_0 = 0.2$	$\rho_0 = -0.1$	$\rho_0 = 0.2$	$\rho_0 = -0.1$	$\rho_0 = 0.2$
$CLRT$	0.0688	0.0694	0.0673	0.0687	0.0645	0.0662
$\lambda = -1$	0.0756	0.0762	0.0706	0.0740	0.0666	0.0685
$\lambda = -0.5$	0.0738	0.0746	0.0697	0.0727	0.0662	0.0670
$\lambda = 0$	0.0725	0.0739	0.0691	0.0720	0.0659	0.0672
$\lambda = 2/3$	0.0726	0.0739	0.0694	0.0719	0.0662	0.0677
$\lambda = 1$	0.0739	0.0747	0.0700	0.0720	0.0662	0.0680
$\lambda = 1.5$	0.0762	0.0769	0.0711	0.0729	0.0674	0.0677

Table 1: Simulated significance level for $\rho_0 = -0.1$ and $\rho_0 = 0.2$.

	$n = 50$	$n = 100$	$n = 200$	$n = 300$
LRT	0.0543	0.0529	0.0527	0.0526
$\lambda = -1$	0.0707	0.0605	0.0559	0.0542
$\lambda = -0.5$	0.0677	0.0594	0.0553	0.0540
$\lambda = 0$	0.0659	0.0577	0.0552	0.0540
$\lambda = 2/3$	0.0670	0.0591	0.0552	0.0540
$\lambda = 1$	0.0686	0.0597	0.0553	0.0541
$\lambda = 1.5$	0.0726	0.0610	0.0564	0.0544

Table 2: Simulated significance level for $\rho_0 = 0$.

For finite sample sizes and nominal size $\alpha = 0.05$, the simulated powers are obtained under H_1 in (12), when $\rho \in \{-0.2, -0.15, 0, 0.1\}$ and $\rho_0 = -0.1$ (Table 3) and when $\rho \in \{0, 0.15, 0.25, 0.3\}$

and $\rho_0 = 0.2$ (Table 4). The (simulated) power for different composite Cressie-Read test-statistics is obtained by

$$\beta_n^{(\lambda)}(\rho_0,\rho) = \Pr(T_n^{\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_1) \text{ and } \widehat{\beta}_n^{(\lambda)}(\rho_0,\rho) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R} I(T_n^{\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|\rho_0,\rho)}{R},$$

and for the CLRT by

$$\beta_n^{(CLRT)}(\rho_0,\rho) = \Pr(\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|H_1) \text{ and } \widehat{\beta}_n^{(CLRT)}(\rho_0,\rho) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R} I(\lambda_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) > \chi^2_{1,0.05}|\rho_0,\rho)}{R}.$$

Among the composite test-statistics with simulated significance levels verifying (20), at first sight the composite test-statistics with higher powers should be selected however since in general high powers correspond to high significance levels, this choice is not straighforward. For this reason, based on $\beta_n^{LRT} - \alpha_n^{LRT}$ as baseline, the efficiencies relative to the composite likelihood ratio test, given by

$$e_n^{(\lambda)} = \frac{(\beta_n^{(\lambda)} - \alpha_n^{(\lambda)}) - (\beta_n^{LRT} - \alpha_n^{LRT})}{\beta_n^{LRT} - \alpha_n^{LRT}},\ \lambda \in \{-1, -0.5, 0.2/3, 1, 1.5\},$$

were considered for $n = 100$, $n = 200$ and $n = 300$. Only the values of the power for $\lambda = -1/2$ are included in Tables 3 and 4, in order to show that the corresponding composite test-statistic is a good alternative to the composite likelihood ratio test-statistic. The values of the powers for which the values of $e_n^{(-1/2)}$ are positive, i.e., the case in which the composite test-statistic associated to $\lambda = -1/2$ is better that the composite likelihood ratio test, are shown in bold in Tables 3 and 4. This choice of $\lambda = -1/2$ divergence based test-statistic has been also recommended in Morales et al. (1997) and Martín et al. (2016).

		$\rho = -0.2$	$\rho = -0.15$	$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.1$
$n = 100$	$CLRT$	0.3584	0.1604	0.2993	0.7958
	$\lambda = -1/2$	**0.3751**	**0.1750**	**0.3057**	**0.8076**
$n = 200$	$CLRT$	0.5455	0.2227	0.5087	0.9705
	$\lambda = -1/2$	**0.5512**	**0.2322**	**0.5114**	**0.9737**
$n = 300$	$CLRT$	0.7770	0.2705	0.8087	0.9962
	$\lambda = -1/2$	**0.7797**	**0.2795**	**0.8112**	0.9970

Table 3: Simulated powers for $\rho_0 = -0.1$.

		$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.15$	$\rho = 0.25$	$\rho = 0.3$
$n = 100$	$CLRT$	0.8054	0.1227	0.1534	0.3689
	$\lambda = -1/2$	**0.8118**	**0.1305**	**0.1602**	**0.3806**
$n = 200$	$CLRT$	0.9813	0.1904	0.2146	0.5818
	$\lambda = -1/2$	0.9825	0.1920	**0.2194**	**0.5957**
$n = 300$	$CLRT$	0.9978	0.2591	0.2870	0.7482
	$\lambda = -1/2$	0.9979	0.2577	**0.2935**	**0.7612**

Table 4: Simulated powers for $\rho_0 = 0.2$.

8 Conclusions

This paper presents the theoretical background for the development of statistical tests for testing composite hypotheses when the composite likelihood is used instead of the classic likelihood of the data. The test statistic is based on the notion of phi-divergence and its by products, that is measures of the statistical distance between the theoretical model and the respective empirical one. The notion of divergence or disparity provides with abstract methods of estimation and testing and four monographs, mentioned in the introductory section, developed the state of the art on this subject.

This work is the first, to the best of our knowledge, which try to link the notion of composite likelihood with the notion of divergence between theoretical and empirical models for testing hypotheses. There are several extensions to this framework which can be considered. The theoretical framework, presented here, would be extended to develop statistical tests for testing homogeneity of two or more populations on the basis of composite likelihood. On the other hand, minimum phi-divergence or disparity procedures have been observed to provide strong robustness properties in estimation and testing problems. It would be maybe of interest to proceed in this direction in a composite likelihood setting.

9 Appendix

9.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Following Sen and Singer (1993, p. 242-3), let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \boldsymbol{\theta} + n^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{v}$, where $\|\boldsymbol{v}\| < K^*$, $0 < K^* < \infty$. Consider now the following Taylor expansion of the partial derivative of the composite log-density,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*}\sqrt{n}\,(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n-\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (21)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*$ belongs to the line segment joining $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n$. Then, observing that (cf. Theorem 2.3.6 of Sen and Singer, 1993, p. 61)

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{P}E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})\right]=E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\boldsymbol{u}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})\right]=-\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

equation (21) leads

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)-\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}\,(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n-\boldsymbol{\theta})+o_P(1). \quad (22)$$

Since $\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{g}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is continuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, it is true that,

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) = \boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}\,(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n-\boldsymbol{\theta})+o_P(1). \quad (23)$$

Since, the restricted maximum composite likelihood estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$ should satisfy the likelihood equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)+\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\mathbf{0}_p,$$

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\mathbf{0}_r,$$

and in view of (22) and (23) it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)-\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\right)+\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n+o_P(1)=\mathbf{0}_p,$$

$$\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta})+o_P(1)=\mathbf{0}_p.$$

In matrix notation it may be re-expressed as

$$\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & -\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ -\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{r\times r}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ n^{-1/2}\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\\ \mathbf{0}_r\end{pmatrix}+o_P(1).$$

Then

$$\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ n^{-1/2}\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\\ \mathbf{0}_r\end{pmatrix}+o_P(1), \tag{24}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & -\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ -\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{r\times r}\end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

This last equation implies (cf. Sen and Singer, 1993, p. 243, eq. (5.6.24)),

$$\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{I}_p-\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

$$\boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=-\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)^{-1},$$

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=-\left(\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)^{-1}.$$

Based on the central limit theorem (Theorem 3.3.1 of Sen and Singer, 1993, p. 107) and the Cramér-Wold theorem (Theorem 3.2.4 of Sen and Singer, 1993, p. 106) it is obtained

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_p,Var_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})]\right).$$

with $Var_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{Y})]=\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then, it follows from (24) that

$$\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ n^{-1/2}\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n\end{pmatrix}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right),$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{p\times r}\\ \mathbf{0}_{r\times p} & \mathbf{0}_{r\times r}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{P}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{R}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\end{pmatrix},$$

or

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{P}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{P}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}-\boldsymbol{\theta})\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_p,\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{P}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{I}_p - \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\\ &= \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\\ &= \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),\end{aligned}$$

and the proof of the lemma is now completed.

9.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Based on equation (24), above,

$$\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) + o_P(1). \tag{25}$$

The Taylor series expansion (21) gives that

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*}\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) = -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*}\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*$ belongs to the line segment joining $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$. Taking into account Theorem 2.3.6 of Sen and Singer (1993, p. 61),

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}^T}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i)\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_n^*} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{P} -\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

and the above two equations lead

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) = \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_P(1). \tag{26}$$

Equations (25), (26) and the fact that $\boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ give that

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}c\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{y}_i) + o_P(1)\\ &= \boldsymbol{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_P(1)\\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\boldsymbol{H}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_P(1),\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.

9.3 Proof of Theorem 5

A second order Taylor expansion of $D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$, considered as a function of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$, around $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}$, gives

$$D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\Big|_{\theta=\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) + o(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}\|^2).$$

Based on Pardo (2006, p. 411-412), we obtain $D_\phi(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}} = \mathbf{0}_p$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} D_\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}} = \phi''(1)\boldsymbol{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})$. Then, the above equation leads

$$\frac{2n}{\phi''(1)} D_\phi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T \boldsymbol{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) + no(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}\|^2),$$

or

$$T_{\phi,n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T \boldsymbol{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) + no(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}\|^2). \tag{27}$$

On the other hand (cf., Pardo, 2006, p. 63),

$$no(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}||^2) \leq no(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2) + no(||\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}||^2),$$

and $no(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2) = o_P(1)$, $no(||\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc} - \boldsymbol{\theta}||^2) = o_P(1)$. Therefore, $o(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}||^2) = o_P(1)$. To apply the Slutsky's theorem, it remains to obtain the asymptotic distribution of the quantity

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc})^T \boldsymbol{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}).$$

From Lemma 4 it is immediately obtained that

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) = \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_P(1).$$

On the other hand, we know that

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_p, \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_p, \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right),$$

and taking into account (27) and Corollary 2.1 of Dik and de Gunst (1985), $T_{\phi,n}(f_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c}, f_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{rc}})$ converge in law to the random variable $\sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i Z_i^2$, where β_i, $i = 1, ..., k$, are the eigenvalues of the matrix $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T$ and

$$k = \text{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}_*^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{Q}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{G}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right).$$

Acknowledgments. The third author wants to cordialy thank Prof. Alex de Leon, from the University of Calgary, for fruitful discussions on composite likelihood methods, some years ago. This research is partially supported by Grants MTM2012-33740 from Ministerio de Economia y Competitividad (Spain).

References

[1] Basu, A., Shioya, H. and Park, C. (2011). *Statistical inference. The minimum distance approach*. Chapman & Hall/CRC. Boca Raton.

[2] Basu, A., Mandal, A., Martin, N. and Pardo, L. Density Power Divergence Tests for Composite Null Hypotheses. arXiv: 1403.0330v3.

[3] Cattelan, M. and Sartiri, N. (2016). Empirical and simulated adjustments of composite likelihood ratio statistics. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **86**, 1056–1067.

[4] Cressie, N., Pardo, L. and Pardo, M.C. (2003) Size and power considerations for testing loglinear models using ϕ-divergence test statistics, *Statistica. Sinica,* **13**, 550–557.

[5] Cressie, N. and Read, T. R. C. (1984). Multinomial goodness-of-fit tests. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* Ser. B **46**, 440-464.

[6] Csiszár, I. (1963). Eine informationstheoretische Ungleichung und ihre Anwendung auf den Beweis der Ergodizitat von Markoffschen Ketten. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutato Int. Kozl.*, **8**, 85–108.

[7] Csiszár, I. (1967). Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, **2**, 299–318.

[8] Dale, J. R. (1986). Asymptotic normality of goodness-of-fit statistics for sparse product multinomials. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **48**, 48–59.

[9] Dic, J. J. and Gunst, M. C. M. (1985). The distribution of general quadratic forms in normal variables. *Statistica Neerlandica*, **39**, 14-26.

[10] Joe, H., Reid, N., Somg, P. X., Firth, D. and Varin, C. (2012). Composite Likelihood Methods. Report on the Workshop on Composite Likelihood. Available at http://www.birs.ca/events/2012/5-day-workshops/12w5046.

[11] Klein, A. Mélard, G. and Zahaf, T. (1998). Computation of the exact information matrix of Gaussian dynamic regression time series models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **26**, 1636–1650.

[12] Kullback, S. and Leibler, R. A. (1951). On information and sufficiency. *Ann. Math. Statistics*, **22**, 79-86.

[13] Kullback, S. (1959). *Information Theory and Statistics*. Wiley, New York.

[14] Liese, F. and Vajda, I. (1987). *Convex statistical distances*. Teubner Texts in Mathematics, Leipzig.

[15] Liese, F. and Vajda, I. (2006). On divergences and informations in statistics and information theory. .*IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **52**, 4394-4412.

[16] Lindsay, G. (1988). Composite likelihood methods. *Contemporary Mathematics*, **80**, 221-239.

[17] Martin, N. and Pardo, L. (2012). Poisson-loglinear modeling with linear constraints on the expected cell frequencies. *Sankhya B*, **74**, 238–267.

[18] Martin, N., Mata, R. and Pardo, L. (2014). Phi-divergence statistics for the likelihood ratio order: an approach based on log-linear models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis,*. **130,** 387–408.

[19] Martin, N., Mata, R. and Pardo, L. (2016). Wald type and phi-divergence based test-statistics for isotonic binomial proportions. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, **120**, 31–49.

[20] Menéndez, M. L., Morales, D., Pardo, L. and Salicrú, M. (1995). Asymptotic behavior and statistical applications of divergence measures in multinomial populations: A unified study. *Statistical Papers,* **36,** 1–29.

[21] Menéndez, M. L., Pardo, J. A., Pardo, L. and Pardo, M. C. (1997). Asymptotic approximations for the distributions of the (h, ϕ)-divergence goodness-of-fit statistics: Applications to Rényi's statistic. *Kybernetes,* **26,** 442–452.

[22] Morales, D., Pardo, L. and Vajda, I. (1997). Some New Statistics for Testing Hypotheses in Parametric Models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **62**, 137 - 168.

[23] Pardo, L. (2006). *Statistical inference based on divergence measures.* Chapman & Hall/CRC. Boca Raton.

[24] Read, T. R. C. and Cressie, N. (1988). *Goodness-of-fit Statistics for Discrete Multivariate data.* Springer-Verlag. New York.

[25] Reid, N. (2013). Aspects of likelihood inference. *Bernoulli* **19**, 1404-1418.

[26] Reid, N., Lindsay, B. and Liang, K.-Y. (2011). Introduction to Special Issue. *Statistica Sinica*, **21**, 1-3.

[27] Rényi, A. (1960). On measures of entropy and information. *Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, **I**., Berkeley, 547-561.

[28] Sen, P. K. and Singer, J. M. (1993). *Large Sample Methods in Statistics.* Chapman & Hall/CRC. New York.

[29] Serfling, R. J. (1980). *Aproximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics.* Wiley. New York.

[30] Sharma, B. D. and Mittal, D. P. (1997). New non-additive measures of relative information. *Journal of Combinatorics, Information & Systems Science,* **2**, 122–133.

[31] Stummer, W. and Vajda, I. (2010). On divergences of finite measures and their applicability in statistics and information theory. *Statistics*, **44**, 169-187.

[32] Vajda, I. (1989). *Theory of statistical inference and information.* Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht.

[33] Xu, X. and Reid, N. (2011). On the robustness of maximum composite estimate. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference,* **141**, 3047-3054.

[34] Zografos, K. (1998). f -dissimilarity of several distributions in testing statistical hypotheses, *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **50**, 295–310.